



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,442	09/26/2005	Seth Houston	A35032-PCT-USA (065855.03)	7436
21003	7590	06/10/2008	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA 44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498			HOANG, SON T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DLNYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/509,442	Applicant(s) HOUSTON ET AL.	
	Examiner SON T. HOANG	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 17, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. **Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37**, have been amended.

Claims 41-44 have been added.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-43** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Applicant's argument towards independent **claims 1, 13, 25, and 27**, regarding the fact that Shoemaker does not disclose the added limitation of "*the at least one question used to query a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources*".

The Examiner concurs with Applicant's remark. However, the newly added limitation is taught in Gronberg et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,324,964, filed on December 6, 2001; hereinafter Gronberg*). Accordingly, Gronberg discloses in Figure 3 a system to

improve a user's online shopping experience by improving the efficiency of a user's online shopping queries. Figure 3 indeed shows a system comprising a homogenizing function 60 under control of the OSP 1 that standardizes that format of commerce item information 33 contained within data feeds 36 received from the distinct vendors 3. The homogenizing function 60 further stores the homogenized commerce item information 33 into the schema of an aggregate database 32 ([Column 2, Lines 51-65]). The database schema associates related or competitive commerce items within the aggregate database 32 such that a user's shopping query of the aggregate database 32 will return commerce item information 33 from distinct vendors 3 for competitive commerce items ([Column 4, Lines 41-50]).

In view of the above, the Examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been fully addressed in this Action. Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. **Claims 41-44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding **claims 41-44**, Applicant capitalized the names of all of claimed databases with the intention to express that these claimed databases were proprietary and/or existed at the time of the invention was made. However,

support for existence of the claimed databases, i.e. "Direct to Consumer Audit", "Hospital and Doctor Integrated Services Audit", "Chemical Audit", "Midas Audit", "Write Decision Audit". Even supports of existence can be found for some claimed databases, i.e. "National Journal", "National Disease and Therapeutic Index", "Daily Rx Audit", can be found, the additional word "Audit" at the end of each database is clearly incorrect.

Furthermore, names of some of the claimed databases contain abbreviations, e.g. Midas or Rx, which are not well-known in the art and are not explained/supported in the disclosure. These abbreviations leave the readers in doubts regarding their particular meanings of the claimed subject matter(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. **Claims 1, 6-13, 18-25, 30-40**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoemaker et al. (*Pub. No. US 2003/0167197, filed on June, 29 2001; hereinafter Shoemaker*) in view of Gronberg et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,324,964, filed on December 6, 2001; hereinafter Gronberg*).

Regarding **claim 1**, Shoemaker clearly shows and discloses a method for accessing sales data ([0018]), comprising the steps of:

receiving a username and a password from a web page (*After visiting the Internet website and entering a valid username and password, the manager is provided access to the account management tool, [0018]*);

identifying an account having the username and the password associated therewith (*Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level, [0018]*);

reading a service level associated with the identified account (*For example, a high-level manager may have access to information about various accounts handled by various account managers, while lower-level account managers may only be provided with access to information about those accounts for which they are responsible, [0018]*);

determining at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the determined

service level associated with the account (*After a valid username and password is entered by an account manager, the account manager is provided an account listing page. High-level managers are allowed to view account information for all account managers under them within the company hierarchy, while lower-level account managers are only allowed access to search for information about their own accounts, [0019]. For example, if the user selects the parameter 'AMERICAS' for 'Region', this is the same as selecting the question 'Which are the accounts in AMERICAS region?' If the user selects the parameter 'Jane Smith' for 'Account Manager', this is the same as selecting the question "Which are the accounts that have Jane Smith as account manager?"*);

populating a list control element of the web page with the at least one question (*The account manager may navigate the account listing page, and other pages of the account management tool accessible through the account listing page, [0019]. See further Figure 2).*

Shoemaker does not explicitly disclose the at least one question used to query a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources.

Gronberg discloses in Figure 3 a system to improve a user's online shopping experience by improving the efficiency of a user's online shopping

queries. Figure 3 indeed shows a system comprising a homogenizing function 60 under control of the OSP 1 that standardizes that format of commerce item information 33 contained within data feeds 36 received from the distinct vendors 3. The homogenizing function 60 further stores the homogenized commerce item information 33 into the schema of an aggregate database 32 ([Column 2, Lines 51-65]). The database schema associates related or competitive commerce items within the aggregate database 32 such that a user's shopping query of the aggregate database 32 will return commerce item information 33 from distinct vendors 3 for competitive commerce items ([Column 4, Lines 41-50]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gronberg with the teachings of Shoemaker for the purpose of retrieving competitive commerce item information from the online entities by applying user's queries on an aggregate database contained commerce item information in homogenized format ([Abstract] of Gronberg).

Regarding **claim 6**, Shoemaker further discloses the determining step is performed by a question and answer framework application (*Figures 2-8 show the process of querying and the results of the queries done by the "Customer Action System"*).

Regarding **claim 7**, Shoemaker further discloses the question and answer framework application searches a database for the at least one questions based upon at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators (*Figure 2*

shows higher-level manager can view the report of a lower-level manager “Jane Smith”).

Regarding **claim 8**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators is the same as the service level (*Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level based on their username and password combination, [0018]*).

Regarding **claim 9**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators is different from the service level (*Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level based on their username and password combination, [0018]*).

Regarding **claim 10**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one question includes at least one parameter (Figure 2).

Regarding **claim 11**, Shoemaker further discloses:

receiving an indication upon a selection of one of the at least one question (*Figure 2 shows “EAST”, “AMERICAS”, “United States” and “Jane Smith” as selection indicator in the drop-down box*);

populating a further list control element of the web page with an at least one parameter (*Control buttons corresponding with items #43, #45*).

Regarding **claim 12**, Shoemaker further discloses the list control element is a drop down box (*Figure 2*).

Regarding **claim 13**, Shoemaker clearly shows and discloses a logic arrangement for accessing sales data ([0018]), wherein the logic arrangement is adapted for an execution by a processing arrangement to perform the steps comprising of:

receiving a username and a password from a web page (*After visiting the Internet website and entering a valid username and password, the manager is provided access to the account management tool, [0018];*);

identifying an account having the username and the password associated therewith (*Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level, [0018];*);

reading a service level associated with the identified account (*For example, a high-level manager may have access to information about various accounts handled by various account managers, while lower-level account managers may only be provided with access to information about those accounts for which they are responsible, [0018];*);

determining at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the determined service level associated with the account (*After a valid username and password is entered by an account manager, the account manager is provided an account listing page. High-level managers are allowed to view account information for all account managers under them within the*

company hierarchy, while lower-level account managers are only allowed access to search for information about their own accounts, [0019]. For example, if the user selects the parameter 'AMERICAS' for 'Region', this is the same as selecting the question "Which are the accounts in AMERICAS region?" If the user selects the parameter 'Jane Smith' for 'Account Manager', this is the same as selecting the question "Which are the accounts that have Jane Smith as account manager?";

populating a list control element of the web page with the at least one question (*The account manager may navigate the account listing page, and other pages of the account management tool accessible through the account listing page, [0019]; see Figure 2 for further illustrations).*

Shoemaker does not explicitly disclose the at least one question used to query a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources.

Gronberg discloses in Figure 3 a system to improve a user's online shopping experience by improving the efficiency of a user's online shopping queries. Figure 3 indeed shows a system comprising a homogenizing function 60 under control of the OSP 1 that standardizes that format of commerce item information 33 contained within data feeds 36 received from the distinct vendors

3. The homogenizing function 60 further stores the homogenized commerce item information 33 into the schema of an aggregate database 32 ([Column 2, Lines 51-65]). The database schema associates related or competitive commerce items within the aggregate database 32 such that a user's shopping query of the aggregate database 32 will return commerce item information 33 from distinct vendors 3 for competitive commerce items ([Column 4, Lines 41-50]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gronberg with the teachings of Shoemaker for the purpose of retrieving competitive commerce item information from the online entities by applying user's queries on an aggregate database contained commerce item information in homogenized format ([Abstract] of Gronberg).

Regarding **claim 18**, Shoemaker further discloses the determining step is performed by a question and answer framework application (*Figures 2-8 show the process of querying and the results of the queries done by the "Customer Action System"*).

Regarding **claim 19**, Shoemaker further discloses the question and answer framework application searches a database for the at least one questions based upon at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators (*Figure 2 shows higher-level manager can view the report of a lower-level manager "Jane Smith"*).

Regarding **claim 20**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators is the same as the service level (*Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level based on their username and password combination*, [0018]).

Regarding **claim 21**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators is different from the service level (*Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level based on their username and password combination*, [0018]).

Regarding **claim 22**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one question includes at least one parameter (Figure 2).

Regarding **claim 23**, Shoemaker further discloses:

receiving an indication upon a selection of one of the at least one question has been selected (*Figure 2 shows "EAST", "AMERICAS", "United States" and "Jane Smith" as selection indicator in the drop-down box*);

populating a further list control element of the web page with an at least one parameter (*Control buttons corresponding with items #43, #45*).

Regarding **claim 24**, Shoemaker further discloses the list control element is a drop down box (*Figure 2*).

Regarding **claim 25**, Shoemaker clearly shows and discloses a system including a processor, a data warehouse, and an Internet connection ([0017]) capable of executing the steps comprising of:

receiving a username and a password from a web page (*After visiting the Internet website and entering a valid username and password, the manager is provided access to the account management tool, [0018];*

identifying an account having the username and the password associated therewith (*Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level, [0018];*

determining a service level associated with the identified account (*For example, a high-level manager may have access to information about various accounts handled by various account managers, while lower-level account managers may only be provided with access to information about those accounts for which they are responsible, [0018];*

determining at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the determined service level associated with the account (*After a valid username and password is entered by an account manager, the account manager is provided an account listing page. High-level managers are allowed to view account information for all account managers under them within the company hierarchy, while lower-level account managers are only allowed*

access to search for information about their own accounts, [0019]. For example, if the user selects the parameter 'AMERICAS' for 'Region', this is the same as selecting the question 'Which are the accounts in AMERICAS region?' If the user selects the parameter 'Jane Smith' for 'Account Manager', this is the same as selecting the question "Which are the accounts that have Jane Smith as account manager?");

populating a list control element of the web page with the at least one question (*The account manager may navigate the account listing page, and other pages of the account management tool accessible through the account listing page, [0019]; see Figure 2 for further illustrations*), the at least one question used to query a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources.

Shoemaker does not explicitly disclose the at least one question used to query a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources.

Gronberg discloses in Figure 3 a system to improve a user's online shopping experience by improving the efficiency of a user's online shopping queries. Figure 3 indeed shows a system comprising a homogenizing function 60

under control of the OSP 1 that standardizes that format of commerce item information 33 contained within data feeds 36 received from the distinct vendors 3. The homogenizing function 60 further stores the homogenized commerce item information 33 into the schema of an aggregate database 32 ([Column 2, Lines 51-65]). The database schema associates related or competitive commerce items within the aggregate database 32 such that a user's shopping query of the aggregate database 32 will return commerce item information 33 from distinct vendors 3 for competitive commerce items ([Column 4, Lines 41-50]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gronberg with the teachings of Shoemaker for the purpose of retrieving competitive commerce item information from the online entities by applying user's queries on an aggregate database contained commerce item information in homogenized format ([Abstract] of Gronberg).

Regarding **claim 30**, Shoemaker further discloses the determining step is performed by a question and answer framework application (*Figures 2-8 show the process of querying and the results of the queries done by the "Customer Action System"*).

Regarding **claim 31**, Shoemaker further discloses the question and answer framework application searches a database for the at least one questions based upon at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators

(Figure 2 shows higher-level manager can view the report of a lower-level manager “Jane Smith”).

Regarding **claim 32**, Shoemaker further discloses wherein the at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators is the same as the service level *(Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level based on their username and password combination, [0018]).*

Regarding **claim 33**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one of a plurality of appropriate service level indicators is different from the service level *(Managers are provided with access to information based upon their particular clearance level based on their username and password combination, [0018]).*

Regarding **claim 34**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one question includes at least one parameter (Figure 2).

Regarding **claim 35**, Shoemaker further discloses:

the processor is configured to receive an indication upon a selection of one of the at least one question has been selected *(Figure 2 shows “EAST”, “AMERICAS”, “United States” and “Jane Smith” as selection indicator in the drop-down box); and*

populate a further list control element of the web page with an at least one parameter *(Control buttons corresponding with items #43, #45).*

Regarding **claim 36**, Shoemaker further discloses the list control element is a drop down box (*Figure 2*).

Regarding **claim 37**, Shoemaker clearly shows and discloses a method for specifying sales data to be accessed as a basis for a report ([0018]), comprising the steps of:

(a) selecting one of an at least one natural language question from a first list control element on a web page (*After a valid username and password is entered by an account manager, the account manager is provided an account listing page. High-level managers are allowed to view account information for all account managers under them within the company hierarchy, while lower-level account managers are only allowed access to search for information about their own accounts, [0019]. For example, if the user selects the parameter 'AMERICAS' for 'Region', this is the same as selecting the question 'Which are the accounts in AMERICAS region?' If the user selects the parameter 'Jane Smith' for 'Account Manager', this is the same as selecting the question "Which are the accounts that have Jane Smith as account manager?"*); and

(b) selecting at least one parameter from a second list control element on the web page (*Figure 2 shows "AMERICAS" as the second parameter in conjunction with first parameter "EAST" to narrow the query for account listing*), wherein the second list control element was created

on the web page after the first selection of the one of the at least one question from the first list control element (*Figure 2 shows "AMERICAS" as the second parameter in conjunction with first parameter "EAST" to narrow the query for account listing. It is inherent that "District" was created first, then "Region" and then "Country"*) and wherein the second list control element was populated with the at least one parameter after the first selection of the one of the at least one question from the first list control element (*Figure 2 shows "AMERICAS" as the second parameter in conjunction with the first parameter "EAST" to narrow the query for account listing. It is inherent that "EAST" was selected first then "AMERICAS"*).

Shoemaker does not explicitly disclose the at least one question used to query a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources.

Gronberg discloses in Figure 3 a system to improve a user's online shopping experience by improving the efficiency of a user's online shopping queries. Figure 3 indeed shows a system comprising a homogenizing function 60 under control of the OSP 1 that standardizes that format of commerce item information 33 contained within data feeds 36 received from the distinct vendors 3. The homogenizing function 60 further stores the homogenized commerce item information 33 into the schema of an aggregate database 32 ([Column 2, Lines

51-65]). The database schema associates related or competitive commerce items within the aggregate database 32 such that a user's shopping query of the aggregate database 32 will return commerce item information 33 from distinct vendors 3 for competitive commerce items ([Column 4, Lines 41-50]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gronberg with the teachings of Shoemaker for the purpose of retrieving competitive commerce item information from the online entities by applying user's queries on an aggregate database contained commerce item information in homogenized format ([Abstract] of Gronberg).

Regarding **claim 38**, Shoemaker further discloses providing a username and password prior to the first selecting step (*Company managers are each provided with a username and a password for use when logging on to use the account management tool*, [0038]).

Regarding **claim 39**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one question is generated at least in part based on the username and password (*Figure 2 shows the query for "EAST", "AMERICAS", "United States" as regular parameters as can be accessed by both lower-level and higher-level managers*).

Regarding **claim 40**, Shoemaker further discloses the at least one parameter is generated at least in part based on the username and password (*Figure 2 shows the query for "EAST", "AMERICAS", "United States" as regular*

parameters as can be accessed by both lower-level and higher-level managers.

Furthermore, Figure 2 shows a special parameter "Jane Smith" as lower-level manager that can only be accessed by higher-level manager).

10. **Claims 2-3, 14-15, and 26-27;** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoemaker et al. (*Pub. No. US 2003/0167197, filed on June, 29 2001; hereinafter Shoemaker*) in view of Gronberg et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,324,964, filed on December 6, 2001; hereinafter Gronberg*), and further in view of Zawadzki et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,107,268, filed on November 9, 1999; hereinafter Zawadzki*).

Regarding **claims 2, 14 and 26**, the combination of Shoemaker and Gronberg does not explicitly disclose the identification step is performed by a security application.

Zawadzki discloses a typical session begins with a user logging-in to the project management server from the web interface. This is accomplished by typing in a user name and password. The user name and password are used to define and determine user access rights in the security module ([Column 27, Lines 22-26])

It would be obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Zawadzki with the teachings of Shoemaker, as modified by Gronberg, for the purpose of preventing unauthorized access when users log-in to the project management system from locations within or outside of the enterprises by determining the identity of the

user and corresponding user's access rights ([Column 4, Lines 17-24] of Zawadzki).

Regarding **claims 3, 15, and 27**, Shoemaker further discloses company managers are each provided with a username and a password for use when logging on to use the account management tool (*After visiting the Internet website and entering a valid username and password, the manager is provided access to the account management tool*, [0018]).

11. **Claims 4-5, 16-17, and 28-29**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoemaker et al. (*Pub. No. US 2003/0167197, filed on June, 29 2001; hereinafter Shoemaker*) in view of Gronberg et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,324,964, filed on December 6, 2001; hereinafter Gronberg*), and further in view of Wright et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0016910, filed on February 9, 2001; hereinafter Wright*).

Regarding **claims 4, 16 and 28**, the combination of Shoemaker and Wright does not explicitly disclose the reading step is performed by a service application.

Wright discloses the web server performs a database lookup against the submitted username and password. If a match is found the web server uses the database to determine the client's access privileges ([0057]).

It would be obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Wright with the teachings of Shoemaker, as modified by Gronberg, for the purpose of enabling users to

indelibly and reliably store and retrieve files in an encrypted state on a remote storage media using a web browser to perform the encryption, decryption, and transfer operations ([0054] of Wright).

Regarding **claims 5, 17 and 29**, Shoemaker further discloses a method, wherein the service application searches a database for an account record having the username associated therewith, and reads the service level from the account record (*The web server performs a database lookup against the submitted username and password. If a match is found the web server uses the database to determine the client's access privileges*, [0057]).

12. **Claims 41-44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoemaker et al. (*Pub. No. US 2003/0167197, filed on June, 29 2001; hereinafter Shoemaker*) in view of Gronberg et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,324,964, filed on December 6, 2001; hereinafter Gronberg*), and further in view of Morrison (*Pub. No. US 2003/0009367, filed on July 6, 2001*).

Regarding **claims 41-44**, the combination of Shoemaker and Gronberg does not explicitly disclose the at least two disparate databases are selected from the group consisting of the National Journal Audit, the Direct to Consumer Audit, the Hospital and Doctor Integrated Services Audit, the National Disease and Therapeutic Index Audit, the Chemical Audit, the Daily Rx Audit, the Midas Audit, and the Write Decision Audit.

Morrison discloses a data storage device comprises one or a plurality of databases selected from the group consisting of a manufacturers/products database, a consumers database, a decision influencers database (such as a professionals database), a participating decision influencers database (such as a participating professionals database), a health insurers/systems database, and combinations thereof ([0137] and Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Morrison with the teachings of Shoemaker, as modified by Gronberg, for the purpose of marketing a health care product by gathering and analyzing information about characteristics of at least one of a consumer and a decision influencer ([Abstract] of Morrison).

Conclusion

13. These following prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

Girn et al. (Pub. No. US 2003/0113727) teaches family history based genetic screening method and apparatus.

Eizenburg et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0026336) teaches method and system for creating one or more customized travel web pages over a computer network.

The Examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support(s) must be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the Examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Contact Information

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 AM – 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Son T Hoang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
June 05, 2008

/S. P./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164
/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165